Docket No.: 1560-0348P

Page 3 of 5

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 9-12, and 14 are pending in this application. Claims 7, 9, and 12 are independent. Claims 5 and 6 have been withdrawn for consideration. In light of the remarks contains herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Arai et al. (U.S. Patent 6,527,642); and rejected claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimura (JP 60-191758) in view of Eda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,044,723). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

## Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicants are filing concurrently with this Reply, a Petition to correct inventorship together with this appropriate supporting documentation together with a claim for priority to Arai et al. (U.S. Patent 6,527,642). Based upon this claim for priority, Applicants respectfully submit that Arial et al. is not prior art but regarded the present application. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

As far the Examiner's rejection of claim 7, the Examiner admits that Kamimura fails to teach or suggest that worm gear arrangement being use in combination with a power steering device. Examiner relies on the teachings of Eda et al. to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No. 09/655,847

Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2005

Docket No.: 1560-0348P

Page 4 of 5

Kamimura. The Examiner concludes it with an obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to use the worm gear arrangement of Kamimura in combination

with a power steering device, taught by Eda et al., in order to provide a means for adjusting the

biasing force and/or the engagement of the worm gears. Applicants respectfully disagree with

the Examiner's characterization of these references and further disagree that one of ordinary skill

in the art would be so motivated to make the purported combination.

The decelerator of Kamimura includes one end of a transmission shaft (25) of a worm

(23) being connected to an operation handle (24). Rotation of the operation handle (24) by an

operator is transmitted to the worm (23) via a rotation shaft (36).

In contrast, worm 71 of the present invention is connected to an electric motor and the

rotation of the electric motor is transmitted to a worm shaft. The load of the operation force

manually applied by an operator is significantly different, from that of the driving force by

electric motor. That such, Kamimura worm type decelerator does not perform the desire

function, even it is combine with the power steering apparatus of Eda. As such, Applicants

maintain that the combination of the references fail to teach or suggest the worm gear

arrangement being use in combination with a power steering device. Further, Applicants

respectfully submitted that there is no motivation to combine the references as disclosed by the

Examiner. Finally, Applicants maintain that the combination of the references fail to perform the

functionality of the claim invention. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner fails

to establish prima facie obviousness by failing to provide references to teach or suggest the claim

invention and by further failing to provide proper motivation in combining the references.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Docket No.: 1560-0348P Application No. 09/655,847 Page 5 of 5

Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2005

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 and 14 are allowable for the reasons set forth

above with regard to claim 7 at least based upon the dependency on claim 7. This Further

respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 12 include the elements similar to those discussed above

with regard to claim 7 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are not

obvious for the references cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No.

52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to

expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future

replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any

additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 19, 2005

Respectfully/submitted

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant